

**REMARKS**

**Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-20 are pending as shown above. Claims 10-20 have been withdrawn from consideration pursuant to a restriction requirement that has been made final. Claim 1 has been reformatted and amended as shown above. Support of the amendment to claim 1 can be found throughout the specification as filed, for example in original claim 1.

**Information Disclosure Statement**

Applicants note with appreciation that duplicate copies of the references were received and receipt of the initialed 1449 forms.

**Rejections Withdrawn**

Applicants note with appreciation that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103 have been withdrawn.

**35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph, Enablement**

Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly not enabled by the specification as filed. (Final Office Action, paragraph 8). It is noted that the rejection is necessitated by applicant's previous amendment to the claim 1, adding the language "introducing a DNA library...under the conditions." (Final Office Action, paragraph 9).

Applicants have removed the previously added language by amendment herein, thereby obviating the rejection.

**35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph, Written Description**

Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly not enabled by the specification as filed. (Final Office Action, paragraph 19). It is noted that the rejection is necessitated by applicant's previous amendment to the claim 1, adding the language "introducing a DNA library...under the conditions." (Final Office Action, paragraph 20).

Applicants have removed the previously added language by amendment herein, thereby obviating the rejection.

**35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

**I. Rejections Based on Previous Amendments**

Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly not enabled by the specification as filed. (Final Office Action, paragraphs 28 and 31). It is noted that the

rejection is necessitated by applicant's previous amendment to the claim 1, adding the language "introducing a DNA library...under the conditions." (Final Office Action, paragraph 29).

Applicants have removed the previously added language by amendment herein, thereby obviating the rejection.

## **II. Dimerization**

Claim 1 and dependent claims 2-9 were also rejected as allegedly failing to make clear whether the fusion protein is dimerizing to itself or to the transcriptional regulatory sequence. (Final Office Action, paragraph 32).

Without conceding the correctness of the Examiner's position and solely to advance prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 1 as shown above to show that fusion proteins dimerize to another fusion protein. Accordingly, the rejection has been obviated.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and request early notification to that effect. Should the Examiner have any further questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 9, 2004

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Dahna S. Pasternak  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 41,411

ROBINS & PASTERNAK LLP  
1731 Embarcadero Road, Suite 230  
Palo Alto, CA 94303  
Tel.: (650) 493-3400  
Fax: (650) 493-3440